United Nations A/C.3/72/SR.52

General Assembly
Seventy-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
19 January 2018

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 52nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 21 November 2017, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Gunnarsson ..... (Iceland)

Contents

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

17-20711 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.12/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Tituaña Matango** (Ecuador), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the text had been streamlined and was more action-oriented. It had also been aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda. The draft resolution, which sought to highlight inequality within and among countries, renewed the international community's moral and political commitment to social development, social inclusion and equality. The Group hoped that it could once more rely on the support of all Member States.

3. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Montenegro, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. **Ms. Walter** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation was disappointed by the inclusion of issues that had no clear link to social development or the work of the Third Committee, as the consideration of unrelated issues was a misuse of resources. The United States expressed concerns about the vague and sweeping references to some trade practices and barriers and their supposed negative impact on economic and social development. Furthermore, the draft resolution inappropriately called upon international financial institutions and other non-United Nations organizations to take actions that went beyond the scope of the draft resolution. The United States would therefore vote against the draft resolution and encouraged other Member States to do so as well. Her delegation underscored that the draft resolution did not change or necessarily reflect the obligations of the United States or other States under treaty or customary international law.

5. With regard to the reference to foreign occupation in the fifteenth preambular paragraph, the United States reaffirmed its abiding commitment to a comprehensive and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and remained committed to supporting the Palestinian people in practical and effective ways, including through sustainable development. The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, referred to in paragraph 37, provided an important universal framework to address a wide range of challenges. The United States understood that corporate responsibility, as mentioned in the draft resolution, was consistent with the Guiding Principles and was not artificially limited to transnational or private corporations.

6. With regard to economic and trade issues, it was inappropriate for the General Assembly to call on international financial institutions to provide debt relief, as in paragraph 45. The demands in paragraph 57, that the international community should increase market access or provide debt relief, were unacceptable. General Assembly resolutions should refrain from using language such as "shall" in reference to action by Member States, as such terminology was only appropriate in binding texts, did not have standing in the Third Committee or any other forum and should not be included in future negotiated documents. The United States understood that all references to transfer of or access to technology referred to voluntary technology transfer on mutually agreed terms and conditions, and that all references to access to information or knowledge referred to that which was made available with the authorization of the legitimate holder. In addition, Member States must collectively avoid any unintended interpretation of the term "equitable", which was used in multiple contexts in the draft resolution, to imply a subjective assessment of fairness that might lead to discriminatory practices.

7. The United States appreciated that the sponsors had removed language in the draft that demonstrated the continued attempts by China to impose its national view of multilateralism and world geopolitics on the international system. The United States could not agree to that language but looked forward to working with China and others in the future to sustain and strengthen the international norms on which the global system was based. Finally, she reiterated her delegation's concerns about the references in the draft resolution to the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda.

8. **Mr. Tituaña Matango** (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group had conducted transparent and open negotiations in which delegations had made difficult concessions in a collective effort to achieve consensus. The Group therefore regretted that the draft resolution would not be

adopted by consensus for the first time in nearly 25 years. The text of the draft resolution had not gone beyond that of previous years, as the updates had been taken from international agreements, such as the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda. Social development was a core purpose of the United Nations. The current worrisome trends in inequality required an adequate response, and sustainable development in rural and urban areas must be supported. He hoped that all delegations would vote in favour of the draft resolution. The Group would continue to work with the President of the General Assembly and the Secretariat to achieve the commitments made in the draft resolution and hoped that the Third Committee, the Commission for Social Development and the high-level political forum could coordinate their efforts on social development.

9. **Mr. Yao** Shaojun (China) said that he was grateful to the representatives of the United States for attaching such importance to the views of China that they had recently mentioned the delegation of China several times. In fact, the ideas put forward by the Chinese delegation were not only those of China, but were in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in support of multilateralism, in the interests of nearly all countries and in step with the times.

10. The Government of the United States was being oversensitive, and his delegation hoped that it would adopt a more open and tolerant attitude in the future. Nevertheless, China had retracted its proposed revision for the benefit of the draft resolution as a whole, the Group of 77 and the Third Committee. He hoped that the delegation of the United States would learn from China's practices in the future, reflect on its own, and make concessions and sacrifices for the good of the majority of countries.

11. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was deeply troubling that, after having been adopted by consensus for decades, the draft resolution was being put to a vote. The decision would have a negative impact on all aspects of development assistance, particularly with respect to the attainment of Sustainable Development Goals. International cooperation in the area of social development was crucial for eradicating poverty and inequality. Her delegation would vote in support of the draft resolution.

12. **Mr. Araújo Prado** (Brazil) said that Brazil invited Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Given that there were many issues on which it was difficult to find consensus, the international community should maintain the opportunities it had to gather to address issue as important as social development and the fight against poverty and inequality. Having coordinated the consultations on the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, his delegation had seen that Member States could work together to promote social development, despite their differences.

13. *At the request of the delegation of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.12/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:
Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:
Armenia.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.12/Rev.1 was adopted by 170 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

15. **Mr. Ríos Sánchez** (Mexico) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution and reaffirmed its commitment to implementing the 2030 Agenda. Nevertheless, Mexico reiterated the need to do away with the anachronistic approach to social development. The General Assembly should focus on the commitments set out in the 2030 Agenda and on the numerous challenges concerning the operations of United Nations entities, including the high-level political forum on sustainable development. The Third Committee was clearly duplicating the work of the Economic and Social Council, the Commission for Social Development, the high-level political forum and the Second Committee. Instead of receiving reports and repeating discussions in five different forums, the General Assembly should focus on developing concrete and effective actions to guide development.

16. **The Chair** suggested that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretariat on the World Social Situation 2017: Promoting inclusion through social protection (A/72/211).

17. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 64: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.61)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.61: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

18. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

19. **Ms. Klein** (Madagascar), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group remained greatly concerned about the rising number of refugees and displaced persons in Africa owing to the instability and insecurity caused by multiple crises and conflicts. Those crises required more attention, as the deplorable situation was further worsened by funding shortfalls.

20. Presenting oral revisions to the text, she said that the words "as well as older persons and persons with disabilities" should be added after "women and children" in the fourth preambular paragraph. In the fifth preambular paragraph, the word "continued" should be added after "gravely concerned about". In the six preambular paragraph, the words "and their host communities" should be added after "the situation of refugees". In the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "funding gaps" should be followed by "in the budgets of UNHCR and WFP, which are among the most underfunded".

21. The tenth preambular paragraph should read: "Welcoming the Special Summit on Protection and durable solutions for Somali Refugees and Reintegration of Returnees in Somali of 25 March 2017 at which the Nairobi Declaration was adopted, the nomination of the United Nations Special Envoy for Somali refugees, the London Conference on 11 May 2017, the Uganda Solidarity Summit on Refugees on 22-23 June 2017, and encouraging those who participated to implement the commitments made therein".

22. A new eleventh preambular paragraph should be added, to read: "Welcoming the outcome of the Oslo Humanitarian Conference on Nigeria and the Lake Chad of 24 February 2017, calling on donors and development partners to fulfil commitments and pledges with the aim of mitigating the humanitarian disasters as well as bringing about durable solutions that will increase the resilience of the people and restore livelihood in the area and welcoming the Berlin Seniors Officials' Meeting of the Oslo Consultative Group on Prevention and Stabilization in the Lake Chad Region of 13 September 2017 where country representatives, donors, and development partners, and regional organizations addressed the structural causes of the crisis, community stabilization, restoration of basic services, local governance systems and the prevention of violence in Nigeria and the region".

23. In the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the words "inter alia, integration, voluntary return, reintegration and resettlement, in addressing the plight of refugees during emergencies" should be replaced with "durable solutions in addressing the plight of refugees during emergencies, and recalls that those solutions include voluntary repatriation and, where appropriate and feasible, local integration and resettlement in a third country, while reaffirming that voluntary repatriation, supported, as necessary, by rehabilitation and development assistance to facilitate sustainable reintegration, remains the preferred solution".

24. A new nineteenth preambular paragraph should be added, to read: "Reaffirming also its resolution 69/313 on the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on the Third International Conference on Financing for Development which is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, supports and complements it, help to contextualize its means of implementation targets with concrete policies and actions, and reaffirms the strong political commitment to address the challenges of financing and creating an enabling environment at all levels for sustainable development in the spirit of global partnership and solidarity".

25. In paragraph 5, "X.CL/928(XXVIII) VI." should be added to the list of decisions and "and its twenty-eighth ordinary session, held in Addis Ababa from 23 to 28 January 2016" should be added after "7 to 12 June 2015". A new paragraph 8 should be added, to read: "Underlines the need to provide an efficient response to internally displaced persons, and recognizes in this regard the importance of the Kampala Convention on protection and assistance to internally displaced persons in Africa". Paragraph 9 should be revised to read: "Acknowledges the important contribution of age, gender and diversity mainstreaming in identifying, through the full participation of women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities, the protection risks faced by the different members of the refugee communities, in particular the non-discriminatory treatment and protection of women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities."

26. In paragraph 11, the word "forced" should be added before "solution", and the words "voluntary return, reintegration and resettlement" should be replaced with "durable solutions, and recalls that those solutions include voluntary repatriation and, where appropriate and feasible, local integration and resettlement in a third country, while reaffirming that voluntary repatriation, supported, as necessary, by rehabilitation and development assistance to facilitate sustainable reintegration, remains the preferred solution". A new paragraph 14 should be added, to read: "Welcomes the adoption of the conclusion on machine-readable travel documents for refugees and stateless persons by the Executive Committee at its 68th session". A new paragraph 16 should be added, to read: "Acknowledges the efforts made by the African countries applying the comprehensive refugee response framework and underscores the importance for the international community of ensuring the appropriate and timely support".

27. In paragraph 24, the words "in accordance with international law" should be added after "right of return". Paragraph 28 should be revised to read: "Expresses serious concern about the expected and continued reduction of the budget allocated to provide humanitarian assistance to refugees and internally displaced persons in Africa in 2018 and 2019 while no substantial decrease in the number of refugees has occurred". In paragraph 30, the words "other relevant humanitarian organizations" should be added after "Office of the High Commissioner and". The words "factoring in the subregional dimension of many forced displacement crises" should be added to the end of paragraph 33. In paragraph 34, the words "the situation of their host communities, refugee camps and" should be added after "inter alia".

28. The African Group invited delegations to join the sponsors and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

29. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Poland, Spain, Timor-Leste and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised. States would be informed before the General Assembly voted on the draft resolution if the extensive revisions had programme budget implications.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.61, as orally revised, was adopted.*

31. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America), referring to the nineteenth preambular paragraph , reiterated her delegation's concerns about the draft resolution's references to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and said that reaffirmations of that document had no bearing on ongoing trade negotiations. She reiterated her Government's position that the Committee's resolutions were non-binding unless the commitments called for therein had been agreed in binding documents.

32. **Mr. Ríos Sánchez** (Mexico), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay said that, in the light of the commitments that had been made by the Member States at the highest level in the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, it was striking that the draft resolution made no mention of that document. The objective of achieving a more equitable distribution of the responsibility for hosting the world's refugees, which was the only way to meet the challenges facing those vulnerable populations, should have been made explicit in the draft resolution.

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, A/C.3/72/L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1: Rights of the Child

33. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.3/72/L.71.

34. **Ms. Tasuja** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and also on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), introduced the draft resolution and read out oral revisions to the text.

35. In the eleventh preambular paragraph, the word "fulfil" should be deleted. In the seventeenth preambular paragraph, the phrase "and the sexual exploitation of children in travel" should be deleted. In the nineteenth preambular paragraph, the phrase "underlines the importance of" preceding the reference to the Paris Agreement should be replaced with the words "the calls for", to read "the calls for the implementation of the Paris Agreement". At the end of the twenty-fourth preambular paragraph, the words "including families, schools and private and public institutions" should be deleted.

36. In paragraph 6, the reference to general comment 19 of the Committee on the Rights of the Child at the end of the paragraph should be deleted, starting with the words "and notes in this regard". The words "to armed conflict" should be added at the end of paragraph 17. Paragraph 21 should be deleted. In paragraph 23, the words "and sexual exploitation of children in travel" should be deleted; "bullying and cyberbullying" should be changed to read "bullying, including cyberbullying". In paragraph 26, the definite article before "relevant entities" should be deleted to read "requests relevant entities". In paragraph 30, "taking into account the best interests of children" should be replaced with "for the best interests of the child as a primary consideration". In paragraph 35, the definite article before "illegal arms trade" should be deleted to read "including violence linked to illegal arms trade".

37. At the end of subparagraph 36 (d), the words "and to follow a system-strengthening approach, with a focus on establishing an integrated child protection system" should be deleted. The reference to sexual and reproductive health in subparagraph 36 (h) should be moved. The first part of that paragraph would thus read: "To develop coherent and coordinated protection systems, to provide universal access to quality comprehensive social, physical and mental health, including sexual and reproductive health, and legal and counselling services for all victims and survivors, to ensure their full recovery and reintegration into society".

38. Subparagraph 37 (h) should use the wording of paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 71/175. In subparagraph 37 (i), the word "particular" before "focus" should be deleted and "issues" should be added after "disability". In subparagraph 37 (j), the words "working towards" should be added to read "while working towards ensuring".

39. The new subparagraph 37 (m) bis should read: "To improve the situation of children living in poverty, in particular extreme poverty, deprived of adequate food and nutrition, water and sanitation facilities, with limited or no access to basic physical and mental health care services, shelter, education, participation and protection, taking into account that, while a severe lack of goods and services hurts every human being, it is particularly threatening and harmful to children, leaving them unable to enjoy their rights, to reach their full potential, to participate as a full member of society, and exposed to conditions that lead to increased violence".

40. In subparagraph 37 (p), the phrase "and sexual exploitation of children in travel" should be deleted.

41. The focus of the draft resolution was on eliminating all forms of violence against children. The draft resolution renewed the mandate of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children and served as a renewal of the collective commitment to prevent deaths and suffering of children, which was needed to achieve target 16.2 under Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

42. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Australia, Belize, Canada, Cuba, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Turkey had joined the sponsors.

43. **Mr. Marshall** (Barbados), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), said that cross-regional cooperation among the traditional sponsors of the annual draft resolution showed that consensus could be garnered on a critical issue despite national differences. In order to reach broader consensus, and to ensure that the draft resolution did not represent a single dominant view, the sponsors must offer satisfactory

solutions to bridge divides. CARICOM always sought a reasonable middle ground and was guided, primarily, by the best interest of the child, as well as the fundamental tenets of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Rather than take national differences as a starting point for negotiations, a practice that led down a combative path, CARICOM sought to identify fundamental points of agreement and highlight good practices. The resulting multilateral process respected the sovereign rights of all States and enabled them to promote and protect the rights of the child. CARICOM looked forward to adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

44. **Ms. Abdelkawy** (Egypt), speaking also on behalf of Algeria, Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, the Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe, said that articles 5 and 14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child clearly stipulated that States Parties should respect the right and responsibility of families to give appropriate religious and moral guidance to the child. Parents and legal guardians must therefore have the right to direct their children's education, especially with regard to culturally and religiously sensitive matters such as education on sexual and reproductive health. For it to be acceptable, the draft resolution must state that parents and legal guardians had the authority to direct and guide their children, yet every attempt to add wording to that effect had been rejected by the facilitators. In particular, paragraph 36 (k) called on States to implement education programmes on sexual and reproductive matters for children as young as ten years old without the direction or consent of their parents or legal guardians, which went against the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

45. She proposed that subparagraph 36 (k) should be amended to read: "To accelerate efforts to scale up scientifically accurate age-appropriate comprehensive education, relevant to cultural contexts, that provides adolescent girls and boys and young women and men, in and out of school, consistent with their evolving capacities, with appropriate direction and guidance from parents, and legal guardians with information on sexual and reproductive health, gender equality and women's empowerment, human rights, physical, psychological and pubertal development and power in relationships between women and men, to enable them to build self-esteem and informed decision-making, communication and risk reduction skills and develop respectful relationships, in full partnership with young people, parents, legal guardians, caregivers, educators and health-care providers in order to protect them from violence;".

46. Speaking in her national capacity, she noted that the wording of subparagraph 36 (k) had reproduced that of paragraph 62 (c) of General Assembly declaration 70/266, where it had been balanced with a sovereignty clause, whereas the same had not been done in the draft resolution. She cautioned against transposing wording taken out of context.

47. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan) said that the International Criminal Court (ICC) had been a threat to stability in Africa and elsewhere in the world and had been an impediment to peace in her country since 2003, having kept the United Nations from acknowledging the peace agreement that had been concluded there. Her delegation requested that the words "inter alia, through the International Criminal Court" at the end of paragraph 16 be deleted.

48. **Ms. Matlhako** (South Africa) said that her delegation would support the draft resolution as orally amended by its main sponsors.

49. **Ms. Pinto Lopes D'alva** (Guinea Bissau) and **Mr. Thinyane** (Lesotho) withdrew their delegations' sponsorship of the draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised.

50. **Ms. Tasuja** (Estonia), speaking on behalf the main sponsors of the draft resolution, said that a clear reference to the ICC was vital. The Court had been established to prosecute individuals for crimes that could include violations of the rights of the child, as had been shown in the Lubanga case, and dispensed justice for the most serious crimes when that was not possible at the national level. The European Union recognized that fighting impunity at the international level had a multiplier effect at the domestic level and was fully committed to helping to ensure accountability for crimes falling within the Court's jurisdiction. The paragraph in question was well-balanced and carefully phrased and had been a long-standing part of the text. She called for a vote on the proposed oral amendment to paragraph 16.

51. **Ms. Silvera Flores** (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of the main sponsors, called for a vote on the proposed oral amendment to subparagraph 36 (k). Speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, she said that States must provide children with a comprehensive

education that enabled them to become responsible adults and build healthy families and communities and that protected them against violence. The subparagraph was therefore an essential part of the draft resolution and had been worded to take into account concerns relating to the differences in maturity among children of different ages and cultural contexts. Her delegation would vote against the proposed amendment.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

52. **Mr. Wenaweser** (Liechtenstein), speaking on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that the oral amendment was unfortunate, as it was trying to change a paragraph that had been agreed language for more than 10 years, including in the previous resolution on the rights of the child. The International Criminal Court had a key role to play in ending impunity when national courts were unwilling or unable to exercise jurisdiction. The Security Council, in its resolution 2250 (2015) on children and armed conflict, had recognized that the fight against impunity for the most serious crimes of international concern had been strengthened through the Court's work on and prosecution of crimes committed against children. As stated in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the objective of such investigations and prosecutions was to end impunity for the perpetrators of those crimes and thus contribute to the prevention thereof. Ending crimes against children went to the heart of the resolution on the rights of the child. It was therefore deeply disturbing that the established consensus was being attacked for reasons that had nothing to do with the topic addressed in the draft resolution. Those countries called upon all delegations to vote against the amendment.

53. **Mr. González Serafini** (Argentina), speaking on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay, said that the establishment of the International Criminal Court, as the first permanent tribunal set up to end impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern of the international community, had been an important achievement towards a rules-based world order. By ensuring that those accused were judged with fairness and full respect for their rights, the Court was a vehicle for justice and peace. The role of the Court in protecting children affected by armed conflict and ending impunity for crimes committed against children was well established in several provisions of the Rome Statute. In the light of those considerations, the language in paragraph 16 of the draft resolution relating to the International Criminal Court was not only factually correct but also thematically relevant and, therefore, merited being kept in its integrity as part of the agreed text, as in previous years. Those countries would vote against the proposed amendment.

54. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) noted that her delegation had already made a statement on its position on the International Criminal Court, but with regard to the resolution on the rights of the child, it attached great importance to the fight against impunity for crimes and violations committed against children in armed conflict, and ensuring accountability for such violations was an important task for national Governments and the international community. When the General Assembly had begun to include the International Criminal Court in various resolutions ten years earlier, her delegation had shared the common hope that the Court would play a positive role in ensuring accountability, but that, unfortunately, had not transpired. The Court, unlike other organs of the international criminal justice system, ad hoc and joint tribunals and national courts, had done nothing to protect children. Her delegation therefore supported the amendment proposed by the Sudan, because the Court had lost its credibility and could not be cited as an example in ensuring accountability for violations against children in armed conflict.

55. *A recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Algeria, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Iraq, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New

Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Qatar, Rwanda, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia.

56. *The oral amendment to paragraph 16 of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised, was rejected by 102 votes to 19, with 39 abstentions.*

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

57. **Mr. Ajayi** (Nigeria) said that, given the unambiguous role of parents in the development of children, in Africa it was recognized that there was no basis for discussing the development of children without including the complementary role of parents. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

58. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the amendment, as it was of the view that promoting and protecting the rights of the child was best done with the involvement of the child's parents or legal guardians. It was unfortunate that the mere mention of children being guided by their own parents had become the subject of a vote, especially considering that the amendment was agreed language from General Assembly resolution 70/137 on the rights of the child.

59. **Mr. Jelinski** (Canada), speaking on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, Norway, Liechtenstein and Switzerland, said that the amendment aimed to change and weaken language pertaining to gender equality that had been agreed by all Member States in previous resolutions. The paragraph in question spoke to the need to ensure comprehensive education for adolescent girls and boys and young women and men, which was a critical issue when discussing violence against children. The paragraph used carefully developed compromise language that had been agreed in at least four other resolutions or declarations over the past two years. The draft resolution already referred to education "in full partnership with parents and guardians", stated clearly that education should be "age-appropriate" and referred only to "adolescent girls and boys and young women and men". It therefore addressed potential sensitivities in a resolution on the rights of the child. Although those countries had wished to see stronger language in the paragraph, they had been willing to accept the compromise tabled by the facilitators. The proposed amendments, however, upset the carefully balanced compromise. Those countries would therefore vote against the amendment.

60. **Ms. Mozolina** (Russian Federation) said that the issue in paragraph 36 (k) was not gender equality but access to education, in other words, the realization of the right of the child to education. In the understanding of her delegation, article 5 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child applied also to the right of the child to education and to access to education. The amendment proposed was therefore entirely reasonable and based on the provisions of the Convention. Her delegation would vote in favour of the amendment.

61. *A recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment to paragraph 36 (k) of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan,

Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Abstaining:

Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Maldives, Nepal, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka.

62. *The oral amendment to paragraph 36 (k) of draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 90 votes to 76, with 8 abstentions.*

63. **Ms. Tasuja** (Estonia), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union was disappointed with the amendment. The issue of comprehensive education for adolescent girls and boys and young women and men in and out of school was critical for their development and that of society. They had the right to learn about their sexual and reproductive health, human rights, bodies and sexuality and about gender equality and power in relationships between women and men. The theme of the draft resolution, violence against children, necessitated the strongest possible language in that regard. Ensuring the provision of formal and non-formal age-appropriate education for children and adolescents was a fundamental step in empowering children to be able to fully enjoy their rights and live free from all forms of violence against them. The European Union did not see paragraph 36 (k) as amended as a basis for future consensus and regretted that the amendment would lead to a vote on the entire resolution. As it had not been possible to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, the European Union encouraged all delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

64. **Mr. Ajayi** (Nigeria) thanked delegations for showing solidarity, support, partnership and cooperation by voting in favour of the amendment.

65. **Mr. El Hacen** (Mauritania) said that it should be understood by everyone in the room that the members of the Committee all belonged to different cultures and all were obliged to respect one another's identity. Mauritanians believed that the family was a societal entity and a sacred bond that must be respected, and parents alone had the full right and responsibility to raise their children and instill in them their deeply-held values. For those reasons, his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment.

66. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had joined the sponsors: Algeria, Belarus, Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

67. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali,

Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

None.

68. *Draft resolution A/C.3/72/L.21/Rev.1, as orally revised and amended, was adopted unanimously.*

69. **Mr. Staff** (United States of America) said that the United States had voted in favour of the draft resolution to underscore the priority it placed on protecting and promoting the well-being of children. Nevertheless, his delegation wished to clarify its position on several of the provisions. The draft resolution did not imply that States that had not done so must become parties to any instrument or fulfil related obligations. Any reaffirmation of prior documents in the draft resolution applied only to those States that had affirmed them initially, which included the language in the first and sixth preambular paragraphs, as well as paragraphs 4 and 9. Furthermore, the current draft resolution and others adopted by the Third Committee did not change or necessarily reflect the obligations of the United States or other States under treaty or customary international law, including with respect to the language in the sixteenth preambular paragraph and paragraphs 2, 9, 10, 11, 23, 37 (c), 37 (n) and 37 (q). With respect to paragraph 2, the United States noted that reservations were an accepted part of treaty practice and were permissible except when prohibited by a treaty or incompatible with the its object and purpose. With respect to paragraph 37 (i), the United States underscored that human rights violations resulted from the conduct of State officials and agents, not that of private parties.

70. The United States understood references in the draft resolution to persons in vulnerable situations or marginalized communities to include lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, as well as persons with disabilities. With regard to education, the United States had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the State would continue to address the educational goals and recommendations of the draft resolution as appropriate and consistent with current United States law and the federal Government's authority. He reiterated his delegation's concerns about references to the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement.

71. The United States understood the language in paragraph 13 to refer to the "production" of child pornography. Regarding paragraph 9, concerning migrant children, which reaffirmed paragraphs 40 to 87 of General Assembly resolution 71/177, the United States provided substantial protections under the Constitution and national legislation to individuals within its territory, regardless of their immigration status. His delegation interpreted the references in the resolution to due process and other protections, including for persons seeking to cross an international border and in the context of returns, to be consistent with existing national laws and policies. He also reiterated the sovereign right of all States to regulate the admission and expulsion of foreign national from its territory, subject to international obligations.

72. The United States disassociated itself from paragraph 10, as the references to "the best interests of the child" were derived from the Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which the United States was not a party. He reiterated his delegation's concerns, expressed in an explanation of position on the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants (A/71/415), with regard to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, which reaffirmed paragraph 67 of General Assembly resolution 71/177. Furthermore, no language in the draft resolution would prejudge or prejudice the upcoming negotiation of a global compact for safe, orderly and regular migration.

73. His delegation understood paragraph 37 (h) to call on States to work to ensure that marriage was entered into only with the informed, free and full consent of the intending spouses. The United States complied with the call to enact and enforce laws concerning the minimum age of consent and marriage in terms consistent with its respective national and state authorities. With respect to

the reference to foreign occupation in the seventeenth preambular paragraph, the United States reaffirmed its abiding commitment to a comprehensive and lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and remained committed to supporting the Palestinian people in practical and effective ways, including through sustainable development.

74. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Singapore had been a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child since 1995 and had recently submitted its fourth and fifth periodic reports to the Committee. Her delegation wished to express its reservations on paragraph 11, as it reaffirmed paragraphs from previous resolutions on which her delegation had also expressed reservations, in line with her country's reservations to the Convention. Singapore had nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution in support of its objectives to protect the rights of children.

75. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan) said that her delegation wished to thank the States that had supported the amendments to the resolutions on the rights of the child and protection of displaced persons out of their support for genuine international criminal justice. The Sudan reaffirmed its commitment to protecting the rights of the child and had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

76. Since 2011, the Sudan had showed tangible progress in the area of children's rights, which had been recognized by the Security Council. In March 2016, the Sudan had signed an action plan with the United Nations to protect children in Darfur from violations in armed conflict, a step which had been hailed by the United Nations and many Governments. With respect to the voluntary return of displaced persons to Darfur, the Government of the Sudan had created a plan and had built villages equipped with decent services for voluntary returnees.

77. Attempts by the International Criminal Court to impose its jurisdiction on the Sudan, through the machinations of certain States and the lack of professionalism and independence among its judges, had imposed a great burden on the Sudan that hampered its efforts towards a comprehensive peace in Darfur in accordance with the 2011 agreement and the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement of 2005, which had led to the self-determination of South Sudan.

78. Despite the threat posed by the International Criminal Court to the sovereignty, independence and unity of the Sudan, the Sudanese delegation engaged sincerely with the sponsors of the resolution, which contained references to the Court, in order to arrive at a draft that was acceptable to all. Although its suggestions had not been heeded, the Sudan was committed to the general goal of the two resolutions and therefore voted in favour of them.

79. **Mr. Yesod** (Israel) said that his country was fully committed to the promotion and protection of the rights of children. It had consistently sought to fulfil its obligations with a broad range of legislation and government programmes and had ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child and two of its Optional Protocols. Israel had actively participated in the negotiations of the draft resolution. Unfortunately, some delegations had preferred to politicize the text. While Israel and other delegations had strongly objected to the inclusion of politicized language in the text, it had regrettably remained in place.

80. **Mr. Herrmann** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation welcomed the purpose and general intention of the draft resolution but remained concerned about the refusal to seek consensus on the health and education of children and to include language concerning the centrality of the family and parents in caring for children, as clearly defined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

81. As defined by the United Nations, adolescents were children and, as such, depended on their family and parents for their development, education and the protection and fulfilment of their fundamental human rights. All efforts must therefore be made to address violence against children and to support families, parents and legal guardians in their effort to ensure that children grew up in a loving and nurturing environment free from fear and conducive to integral human development, as had been included in the amended text. The commitment to consensus should be respected, even when a draft resolution was not threatened with a vote or an amendment.

82. The Holy See wished to express its reservations to the draft resolution. It considered the terms "sexual and reproductive health" and "sexual and reproductive health-care services" to refer to a holistic concept of health, which did not include abortion, access to abortion or access to abortifacients. Regarding information on sexuality, the Holy See reaffirmed the primary responsibility and the prior rights of parents, including their right to freedom of religion, in the education and upbringing of their children, as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention.

83. **Ms. Khusanova** (Russian Federation) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and supported the majority of its provisions. Unfortunately, the main authors had been unwilling to include a reference to the role of the family in raising children and protecting them from violence. Her delegation could not understand such an approach, given that, according to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the family, as the natural environment for the growth and well-being of children, should be provided necessary protection and assistance. It hoped that mutually acceptable compromises would be reached in the following year to reflect that important aspect of children's lives in the equivalent draft resolution and enable its adoption by consensus.

84. **Mr. De Souza Monteiro** (Brazil) said that his delegation dissociated itself from paragraph 36 (k), upon the adoption of the hostile amendment, and regretted that, in the absence of an agreement, the long-standing practice of reverting to agreed language had not been observed.

85. **Ms. Moutchou** (Morocco) said that her delegation regretted the politicization of one of the most important resolutions for children and hoped that the spirit of consensus would be respected in future negotiations. Morocco undertook a number of measures to fulfil its national and international commitments to protect the rights of children and maintained its position in favour of the draft resolution and the international commitments contained therein.

86. There was a significant lack of sexual education in schools and in families, despite the fact that it was essential to avoiding sexual harassment, rape and unwanted pregnancies. Girls and boys should be knowledgeable about the reproductive system, good forms of contraception and sexually transmitted diseases. When those issues were not addressed by the State, young people turned to the Internet and social media to find answers to their questions, where they could come across false information and pornographic videos. Social taboos surrounding sexuality and sexual education were a significant handicap that all States must take into consideration, as a lack of information could lead to sterilization, abortion and forced contraception. She hoped that the Third Committee would be successful in finding compromises that would lead to consensus on future resolutions.

87. **Mr. Ríos Sánchez** (Mexico) said that his delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 36 (k) and regretted that the agreed-upon text had not been respected. The best way to achieve consensus was to use consensus language, which the original version of the paragraph had incorporated.

88. **Ms. Silvera Flores** (Uruguay) said that her delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 36 (k), given that it was not consensus language and the paragraph had been modified.

89. **Mr. González Serafini** (Argentina) said that Argentina had voted in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with its position to prioritize consensus and the adoption of texts. His delegation was deeply concerned that the hostile amendment to the draft resolution had been supported by some delegations that had agreed to join the consensus, including some sponsors. The text of the draft resolution had contained agreed-upon language that had been adopted by consensus in related resolutions in previous years. His delegation expressed its deep concern that the Third Committee had not been able to uphold the principle of consensus and that the amendments to the text had not been presented informally during the negotiations. Given that achieving consensus required flexibility from all actors, it would be advisable to move away from practices that imposed viewpoints and ideologies.

90. With regard to the text, his delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 36 (k). No paragraph should be considered in a vacuum. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to reaffirm the Convention on the Rights of the Child in its totality, including article 5. There were several paragraphs in the draft resolution that highlighted the role of parents in all aspects of children's lives, including with respect to the full exercise of their rights, which included the right to education.

91. **Ms. Matar** (United Arab Emirates), speaking on behalf of Saudi Arabia and Bahrain as well as her own country, said that while those countries supported the resolution, that support did not extend to any paragraph or language that could be interpreted to contradict the provisions of their domestic laws, and was in line with their international obligations.

92. **Ms. León** Murillo (Costa Rica) said that her delegation regretted that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus and disassociated itself from paragraph 36 (k).

93. **Mr. Molina Linares** (Guatemala) said that his delegation regretted that the spirit of collaboration and consensus had been lost in recent years in the negotiation of such an important resolution. His delegation lamented that the hostile amendment to paragraph 36 (k) had been adopted by a vote and disassociated itself from that paragraph.

94. **Mr. Habich** (Peru), **Mr. Irimia Arosemena** (Panama), **Ms. Cid Carreño** (Chile) and **Mr. Carabalí Baquero** (Colombia) said that their delegations disassociated themselves from paragraph 36 (k).

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.